REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14, 16-18, 20, 21, and 24-39 were rejected, and the remaining claims were objected to. Claims 1, 7, 14, 24, 28, and 36 have been amended herein. New claims 40-44 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-44 are active in the application. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 12-13, and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McClennon et al., U.S. Patent 6,408,327 ("McClennon"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended are neither taught nor suggested by McClennon.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to include the limitation of receiving a multiple channel second packet voice data stream from a second conferencing endpoint. The specification of the present application discloses the multiple channel input feature of the invention for example in figures 3 and 4 where a stereo input microphone is shown. Multiple channel inputs are advantageous for example because a system employing the method of claim 1 could preserve information relating to the location of several participants at a single endpoint received as a stereo data stream and further manipulate this information to compress the stereo sound field into a smaller sound field of a presentation sound field. In contrast, a system receiving only single channel packet voice data streams from a single microphone would not preserve information about where multiple participants were located at an endpoint.

McClennon does not teach or suggest receiving multiple channel inputs from an endpoint. For example, each figure in McClennon shows endpoints including only one microphone to capture data monaurally. Therefore, McClennon does not teach each and every element of amended claims 1 and 7 for at least the reason that McClennon does not teach receiving a multiple channel second packet voice data stream. Claims 3-5, 7-9, and 12-13 are directly or indirectly dependent on claims 1 and 7 and therefore also teach limitations not taught by McClennon.

Claim 24 has been amended to include the limitation of a means for receiving multiple packet voice data streams where at least one of the multiple packet voice data streams comprises at least two channels. McClennon does not teach a means for receiving

multiple packet voice data streams where at least one of the multiple packets voice data streams comprises at least two channels for at least the reason that McClennon only discloses the use of single microphone inputs that receive sounds monaurally as a single channel. Therefore, McClennon does not teach each and every element of claim 24. Claims 25-27 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 24 and therefore also teach limitations not taught by McClennon.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClennon. Applicant respectfully submits that McClennon fails to create a *prima facie* case of obviousness for these claims, based on the amendments discussed above.

Claims 2, 18, and 21 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1 or 7 and therefore McClennon does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of claim 2, 18, and 21 for at least the same reasons as claim 1 or 7. McClennon does not even reference an endpoint capable of receiving a data stream comprising multiple channels. Regarding claim 18, McClennon also does not teach or suggest that a sector can be divided into independently manipulable subsectors.

Claims 6, 10, 16, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClennon in view of Smits, U.S. Patent 6,125,115 ("Smits"). Applicant respectfully submits that McClennon and Smits fail to create a *prima facie* case of obviousness for any of these claims.

Claims 6, 10, 16, 17, and 20 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1 or 7 and therefore McClennon does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of claims 6, 10, 16, 17, and 20 for at least the same reasons as claim 1 or 7. Additionally, Smits also does not even reference an endpoint capable of receiving a data stream comprising multiple channels. Notably, Smits does teach a single microphone capable of capturing multiple voices and separating the voices into subchannels. However, subchannels are different than multiple channels and the two have been carefully distinguished in the specification and claims. For example, subchannels are defined as the result of dividing a single channel of a packet voice data stream into multiple parts (subchannels) to represent separate voices comprising the single channel. The endpoints disclosed in McClennon have only one microphone and are not capable of capturing multiple channels. Therefore, the combination of McClennon and Smits do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of claim 6.

Claims 28-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, in part as being unpatentable over McClennon and in part as being unpatentable over McClennon in view of Smits.

Claims 28-35 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 24 and therefore McClennon does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of claims 28-35 for at least the same reasons as claim 24. Additionally, Smits also does not even reference an endpoint capable of receiving a data stream comprising multiple channels. Therefore, the combination of McClennon and Smits do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of claims 28-35.

Claim 36 has been amended to include the limitation of a decoder, to decode a multiple channel packet voice data stream. The claim has also been amended to distinguish between channels and subchannels. Neither McClennon nor Smits disclose or suggest using a conferencing endpoint to receive a multiple channel input. The claimed invention can thus provide more robust voice arrival direction information in the final presentation sound field than both McClennon and Smits. Claim 37 and 38 are dependant on claim 36 and therefore also not obvious with respect to McClennon and Smits for at least the same reason as claim 36.

The elements of claim 39 are neither taught nor suggested by the references. Neither McClennon nor Smits disclose or suggest a controller to negotiate with other packet voice conferencing systems connected in a common conference wherein the results of a negotiation include a presentation sound field sector allocated to the local audio capture channels. The specification of the present application provides examples of the benefits of this operation beginning on page 22, line 22. Claim 39 should therefore be allowable. New dependent claim 44 has been added and is dependant from claim 39 and should also be allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15, 19, 22, and 23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims have been added as new independent claims 40-43 that correspond to objected claims 15, 19, 22, and 23. These claims are therefore in condition for allowance.

New claims

New claims 40, 41, 42, and 43 have been added as new independent claims that correspond to objected claims 15, 19, 22, and 23. New claim 44 has been added and is dependant on claim 39.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-44 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

James E. Harris
Reg. No. 40,013

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number 1-703-872-9306, on July 7, 2004.

Lauren Ballard-Gemmell